

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-11 and 14-22 are requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for conducting an interview with Applicant's representative on September 3, 2010. The following comments reflect the substance of the interview.

Claims 2, 7, 15, 16, 18, 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, claims 2 and 7 are rejected for the recitation of "the integrated map data." This recitation is amended herein to recite "the integrated name data" in claims 2 and 7, the antecedent basis for which is provided in independent claims 1 and 6, respectively.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8-11, 17, 20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Saeki et al (US 6,320,519) in view of Wu et al (US 6,564,224).

Claims 2, 4, 7, 14-16, 18, 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Saeki in view of Wu and Chitradon et al (US 7,308,117).

The rejections are traversed.

Claims 1, 3, and 6 are amended to further clarify that the single set of name data for a road is used in all of the individual map area blocks in which the

road is present. Support for these amendments is present in the specification in at least page 2, line 11 – page 3, line 10; page 5, lines 7-21; and page 15, line 21 – page 17, line 14. As described therein, by providing the single set of name data for the road, redundant data is eliminated and the amount of data that has to be transmitted is significantly reduced. As described below, the prior art does not include this feature of the claim or the advantages that it achieves.

Applicant submits that Saeki and Wu do not teach or suggest “integrated name data that provides common name information for a road, such that the integrated name data provides a single set of name data for the road for use in all of the individual map area blocks in which the road is present,” as claimed in amended claim 1. With respect to this portion of the claim prior to the present amendment, the Office Action relied on Wu. *See column 9, line 66-column 10, line 17, column 14, line 17-column 15, line 50, column 5, line 1-column 6, line 15, Fig. 4, elements 406, 407.*

Wu discloses that street names are considered for matching corresponding roads from two different two road map databases as a single road in order to combine the two road map databases. *See column 9, line 66-column 10, line 17.* In other words, Wu compares two different sets of data to determine if the data in one database corresponds to the data in another. If there is a match, the two sets of data are sewn together. However, Wu does not disclose or suggest providing integrated name data that provides a single set of name data for the road for use in all of the individual map area blocks in which the road is present.

Instead of providing such integrated name data, Wu simply recognizes that street names might not match and, if so, abandons the name-matching criteria. *See column 9, lines 55-60.* Thus, Wu does not provide the single set of name data claimed in claim 1. Instead, it provides name data for every portion of its map separately, which increases the amount of data that needs to be transmitted as compared to the present invention.

Saeki also fails to disclose the above-described feature of the claim.

Therefore, amended claim 1 is patentable over Saeki and Wu.

Claims 3 and 6 are patentable over Saeki and Wu for reasons analogous to those for claim 1.

Claims 5, 8-11, 17, 20 and 22 are patentable due to their dependence from claims 1, 3 and 6, respectively.

Claims 2, 4, 7, 14-16, 18, 19 and 21 are patentable due to their dependence from claims 1, 3 and 6, respectively, and because Chitradon does not make up for the above-identified deficiencies of Saeki and Wu.

Claims 2, 4 and 7 are further patentable as set forth below.

Applicant submits that Saeki, Wu and Chitradon do not teach or suggest that “the integrated name data provides the common name information such that the integrated name data provides a single set of name data for the individual map layers and the individual map area blocks,” as claimed in claim 2.

Saeki discloses static priority settings for roads in FIG. 2B, and Wu discloses the above-described comparison of street names between two different sets of data. Chitradon discloses that each level of the map has its own scale that will be displayed on the scale bar to indicate the distance ratio. *See column 5, lines 8-10.* However, Saeki, Wu and Chitradon do not disclose or suggest that integrated name data for providing a single set of name data for the road for the individual map layers and the individual map area blocks. None of the cited excerpts correspond to this feature of the claim.

Therefore, claim 2 is patentable over Saeki, Wu and Chitradon for this additional reason. Claims 4 and 7 are further patentable for the same reasons as claim 2.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

If there are any questions regarding this response or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323, Docket No. 029267.56097US.

Respectfully submitted,

September 9, 2010



Jeffrey D. Sanok
Registration No. 32,169
Cameron W. Beddard
Registration No. 46,545

CROWELL & MORING LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
JDS:CWB:crr
12845734